

Neel Chatterjee (SBN 173985)  
*nchatterjee@goodwinlaw.com*

James Lin (SBN 310440)  
*jlin@goodwinlaw.com*

**GOODWIN PROCTER LLP**  
135 Commonwealth Drive  
Menlo Park, California 94025  
Tel.: +1 650 752 3100  
Fax.: +1 650 853 1038

Brett Schuman (SBN 189247)  
*bschuman@goodwinlaw.com*

Shane Brun (SBN 179079)  
*sbrun@goodwinlaw.com*

Rachel M. Walsh (SBN 250568)  
*rwalsh@goodwinlaw.com*

Hayes P. Hyde (SBN 308031)  
*hhyde@goodwinlaw.com*

**GOODWIN PROCTER LLP**  
Three Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, California 94111  
Tel.: +1 415 733 6000  
Fax.: +1 415 677 9041

Hong-An Vu (SBN 266268)  
*hvu@goodwinlaw.com*

**GOODWIN PROCTER LLP**  
601 S. Figueroa Street, 41st Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90017  
Tel.: +1 213 426 2500  
Fax.: +1 213 623 1673

*Attorneys for Defendant: Otto Trucking LLC*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

WAYMO LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;  
OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING  
LLC,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

**DEFENDANT OTTO TRUCKING'S  
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF WAYMO  
LLC'S MOTION *IN LIMINE* NO. 16**

Hearing Date: September 20, 2017  
Hearing Time: 8:00 a.m.  
Courtroom: 8 (19th Floor)  
Judge: The Honorable William Alsup

Trial: October 10, 2017

Filed/Lodged Concurrently with:  
1. Chatterjee Declaration  
2. Gruver Declaration

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT  
SOUGHT TO BE SEALED

1 Plaintiff Waymo, LLC (“Waymo”) seeks to preclude defendants from putting on testimony  
 2 from one of its own former employees regarding its public disclosure of Waymo’s purported trade  
 3 secrets. Leaving aside the undisputed record that defendant Otto Trucking LLC (“Otto Trucking”)
 4 disclosed Ms. Seval Oz and the earrings made from printed circuit boards during fact discovery,  
 5 Waymo should have disclosed this information itself. Otto Trucking respectfully requests that  
 6 Waymo’s Motion *In Limine* No. 16 be denied.

7 **I. STATEMENT OF FACTS.**

8 Ms. Oz was an employee of Google’s Self-Driving Car Program (Project Chauffeur) from  
 9 approximately March of 2011 through August of 2014. Declaration of Neel Chatterjee in Support  
 10 of Opposition to Waymo’s Motion *in Limine* No. 16 (“Chatterjee Decl.”), Ex. 1. She currently  
 11 works at Aurima, Inc., an artificial intelligence startup focused on autonomous vehicles, funded by  
 12 Waymo’s parent company, Alphabet, through its venture fund, Gradient Ventures. *See id.*

13 The printed circuits boards that ultimately became Ms. Oz’s earrings were not stored in  
 14 any locked or secured location, and were available in many places throughout Project Chauffeur’s  
 15 offices. Declaration of Daniel Gruver, ¶ 5. Daniel Gruver, then-technical program manager on  
 16 Project Chauffeur’s LiDAR team, had a number of printed circuit boards on his desk located in a  
 17 common area accessible to other employees. *Id.* Mr. Gruver recalls that Ms. Oz had suggested  
 18 that the boards could make good earrings. *Id.* at ¶ 7. He did not recall anyone at Project  
 19 Chauffeur expressing concern about Ms. Oz receiving the printed circuit boards. *Id.* at ¶ 8.

20 At no point during discovery has Waymo disclosed Ms. Oz, or the more general practice at  
 21 Google and Project Chauffeur of letting employees retain mementos that included its LiDAR  
 22 systems. Indeed, in its responses to Defendants’ interrogatories, Waymo stated that it was not  
 23 aware of any instances where its purported trade secrets were publicly or otherwise disclosed to  
 24 third parties. Chatterjee Decl., Ex. 2 (Response to Interrogatory No. 6). While taking the  
 25 depositions of several of its former employees, Waymo did not ask them about public disclosure  
 26 of trade secrets aside from a few patents and publications.

27 Otto Trucking listed Ms. Oz as a person likely having discoverable information in its  
 28 Initial Disclosures Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1), served on June 21, 2017. Ex. H to

Waymo's Motion *in Limine* No. 16 ("Waymo Ex.") at 21-22. At all times since then, Ms. Oz has been on Otto Trucking's witness list. Given the accelerated schedule in this case, on or about August 2, 2017, the Special Master requested that the parties pare down their lists of witnesses and eliminate anyone that they did not intend to rely on at trial. Ms. Oz remained on Otto Trucking's witness list, and counsel identified her as a third party who would need to be subpoenaed. Chatterjee Decl., Ex. 3 (H. Vu email to service lists, 8/10/17). At no point did Otto Trucking remove Ms. Oz from its witness lists, and at no point did Waymo attempt to subpoena Ms. Oz or further pursue her deposition. *See id.* at Ex. 4 (H. Vu email to service lists, 8/12/17).

In its interrogatory responses dated July 31, 2017, Otto Trucking expressly disclosed that [REDACTED] Waymo Ex. F, at p. 4 (Objs. and Resps. to Waymo's Second Set Common Rqs). At least two witnesses mentioned or discussed Ms. Oz during their deposition testimony. Chatterjee Decl., Ex. 5 (Dep. of Michael Xing at 14:17-33:4); Ex. 6 (Dep. of Dmitri Dolgov at 44:1-45:9). Ms. Oz's earrings were produced and made available to Waymo's counsel at the deposition of Pierre-Yves Droz on August 22, 2017. *See Id.* at Ex. 7 (Dep. of Pierre-Yves Droz at 33:22-39:8). During that deposition, pictures of the earrings were taken and were included as exhibits to the transcript. Counsel for Otto Trucking has expressly stated that the earrings were available for inspection by Waymo. *Id.* at 39:5-10. Otto Trucking has not received any request to inspect the earrings.

In response to a request for communications with Ms. Oz, third-party Anthony Levandowski produced text messages with Ms. Oz on August 23, which reflected his conversations with Ms. Oz regarding the earrings. *See* Waymo Exs. B, C, D.

## II. ARGUMENT

Waymo contends – without citing to any legal authority – that suspected involvement by Mr. Levandowski in locating Ms. Oz's earrings is somehow a basis for precluding this evidence. This amounts to an absurdity – the mere suspicion that Mr. Levandowski provided information to counsel is not grounds for excluding evidence. Moreover, Waymo's contention that Mr. Levandowski has not cooperated in discovery is not correct, as he has produced documents

1 pursuant to subpoena, including in response to a request regarding Ms. Oz's earrings. In addition,  
 2 Ms. Oz had discussed the earrings with others at Project Chauffeur. *See* Gruver Decl., ¶¶ 7-9.

3 To the extent that Waymo argues that any involvement by Mr. Levandowski risks a waiver  
 4 of any party's privilege or his rights under the Fifth Amendment, the law is clear that a witness  
 5 may "pick the point beyond which he will not go" and refuse to answer questions about matters  
 6 already discussed. *See Shendal v. U.S.*, 312 F.2d 564, 566 (9th Cir. 1963); *In re Master Key Litig.*,  
 7 507 F.2d 292, 293-94 (9th Cir. 1974) ("The proper inquiry in this case . . . is not whether [the  
 8 witness] waived his privilege simply by giving incriminating testimony as to certain company  
 9 practices, but whether, in light of his prior disclosures, the testimony sought could possibly  
 10 incriminate him further."). Waymo had the opportunity to ask Mr. Levandowski about public  
 11 disclosures and disclosures to third-parties of Waymo's alleged trade secrets, but it chose not to do  
 12 so, either through a subpoena or at a deposition. Waymo cannot now use any purported  
 13 involvement by Mr. Levandowski as a basis for excluding this evidence.

14 As to Waymo's objections under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26 and 37, Waymo's motion fails because  
 15 the record shows that Otto Trucking disclosed Ms. Oz as a witness nearly two months before the  
 16 close of discovery in its initial disclosures. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(c)(1); *see, e.g., 3Com Corp. v.*  
 17 *Realtek Semiconductor Corp.*, No. C 03-2177 VRW, 2008 WL783383, at \*5 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 24,  
 18 2008) (denying motion where at least one document was produced before close of discovery and  
 19 finding no prejudice as to the use of others at trial). She remained on Otto Trucking's disclosures  
 20 even after the parties were asked to pare down their witness lists. As such, Waymo cannot now  
 21 argue that it had no knowledge of her as a witness, or no reason to depose her.

22 None of the four factors identified by Waymo – (1) prejudice or surprise to the party  
 23 against whom evidence is offered; (2) ability to cure any prejudice; (3) likelihood of disruption of  
 24 trial; and (4) bad faith or willfulness – support excluding Ms. Oz's testimony or the earrings  
 25 themselves. *See Lanard Toys Ltd. v. Novelty, Inc.*, 375 Fed. App'x 705, 713 (9th Cir. 2010).  
 26 First, even assuming, *arguendo*, that disclosure of Ms. Oz and the PCB earrings was untimely,  
 27 Waymo cannot argue prejudice because they were equally in possession of this information as  
 28 defendants were. *See, e.g., L&L Franchise, Inc. v. Tsai*, 2008 WL 11337594, at \*2-3 (S.D. Cal.

Mar. 7, 2008) (denying motion to exclude where moving party knew of documents and documents were publicly available). Waymo cannot dispute that Ms. Oz was an employee at Waymo and Project Chauffeur. Waymo also cannot hide its head in the sand and pretend that it did not know of the practices at Project Chauffeur for departing employees to keep mementos, including parts of Waymo's LiDAR systems. Because such disclosures and information can constitute public disclosure of Waymo's purported trade secrets, Waymo should have disclosed this information itself during discovery. Second, Waymo had the opportunity to cure any prejudice that would have resulted, as it had the opportunity to depose or subpoena Ms. Oz and to inspect and photograph the earrings. That Waymo chose not to is no fault of Otto Trucking's. Third, Waymo halfheartedly argues that the earrings and Ms. Oz's testimony will "serve to disrupt trial" by introducing "outdated Waymo technology" that would be inadmissible under Fed. R. Evid. 403. The earrings and Ms. Oz's testimony are relevant to Waymo's public disclosure of its alleged trade secrets and the measures Waymo took to protect its alleged trade secrets. *See, e.g.,* Cal. Civ. Code § 3426.1(d)(2); *Townsend v. Akamai Techs., Inc.*, 2009 WL 10672745, at \*2 (C.D. Cal. May 14, 2009) (granting summary judgment and finding "Plaintiff has presented no evidence that he took reasonable steps" to maintain secrecy). The probative value of this evidence outweighs any potential undue prejudice to Waymo. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 403. Finally, Waymo admits that the Court need not consider the fourth factor, and as demonstrated above, Otto Trucking cannot be said to have abdicated its discovery duties by including a witness in its initial disclosures.

Waymo's meritless accusations appear to rest on the timing of the production of the earrings. The production, however, occurred before the close of discovery and before a large number of depositions took place. Given the compressed schedule in this litigation, all of the parties have been supplementing their productions through the close of discovery. For example, on the last day of fact discovery, Waymo produced over 7200 documents – about one-third of its total production, long after most depositions were completed. Waymo cannot be heard to complain about Otto Trucking's production – let alone seeking sanctions under Rule 37 – in light of their own repeated and belated supplementation of discovery.

For the above-stated reasons, Waymo's Motion *in Limine* No. 16 should be denied.

1 Dated: September 13, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Neel Chatterjee

Neel Chatterjee

*nchatterjee@goodwinlaw.com*

Brett Schuman

*bschuman@goodwinlaw.com*

Shane Brun

*sbrun@goodwinlaw.com*

Rachel M. Walsh

*rwalsh@goodwinlaw.com*

Hong-An Vu

*hvu@goodwinlaw.com*

Hayes P. Hyde

*hhyde@goodwinlaw.com*

James Lin

*jlin@goodwinlaw.com*

**GOODWIN PROCTER LLP**

*Attorneys for Defendant: Otto Trucking LLC*

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I am employed in the County of San Francisco, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is: Three Embarcadero Street, 28<sup>th</sup> Floor, San Francisco, California 94111.

On **September 13, 2017**, I electronically served the following document on the persons below as follows:

**DEFENDANT OTTO TRUCKING'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF WAYMO  
LLC'S MOTION *IN LIMINE* NO. 16**

Charles K. Verhoeven  
David A. Perlson  
Melissa Baily  
John Neukom  
Jordan Jaffe  
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
SULLIVAN, LLP  
50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111-4788

Counsel for Plaintiff: *Waymo LLC*  
Telephone: 415.875.6600  
Facsimile: 415.875.6700  
QE-Waymo@quinnemanuel.com

David Cooper  
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
SULLIVAN, LLP  
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor,  
New York, New York 10010

Counsel for Plaintiff: *Waymo LLC*  
Telephone: 212.849.7000  
Facsimile: 212.849.7100  
QE-Waymo@quinnemanuel.com

Michelle W. Fox  
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
SULLIVAN, LLP  
111 Elizabeth Street, Level 15  
Sydney NSW 2000, Australia

Counsel for Plaintiff: *Waymo LLC*  
Telephone: 011.61.2.9146.3500  
michellefox@quinnemanuel.com

Leo P. Cunningham  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH &  
ROSATI  
650 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050

Counsel for Plaintiff: *Waymo LLC*  
Telephone: 650.493.9300  
Facsimile: 650.493.6811  
lcunningham@wsgr.com

Arturo J. Gonzalez  
Daniel Pierre Muino  
Eric Akira Tate  
Esther Kim Chang  
Matthew Ian Kreeger  
Michael A. Jacobs  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
425 Market Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.*  
and *Ottomotto LLC*  
Telephone: 415.268.7000  
Facsimile: 415.268.7522  
UberWaymoMoFoAttorneys@mofo.com



Michelle Ching Youn Yang  
MORRISON FOERSTER LLP  
2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20006

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.*  
and *Ottomotto LLC*  
Telephone: 202.887.1500  
Facsimile: 202.887.0763  
UberWaymoMoFoAttorneys@mofo.com

Rudolph Kim  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
755 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94304

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.*  
and *Ottomotto LLC*  
Telephone: 650.813.5600  
Facsimile: 650.494.0792  
UberWaymoMoFoAttorneys@mofo.com

Wendy Joy Ray  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
707 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 6000  
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.*  
and *Ottomotto LLC*  
Telephone: 213.892.5200  
Facsimile: 213.892.5454  
UberWaymoMoFoAttorneys@mofo.com

Michael Darron Jay  
BOIES SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP  
401 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 850  
Santa Monica, CA 90401

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.*  
and *Ottomotto LLC*  
Telephone: 310.752.2400  
Facsimile: 310.752.2490  
BSF\_EXTERNAL\_UberWaymoLit@bsflp.com

Meredith Richardson Dearborn  
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP  
435 Tasso Street, Suite 205  
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.*  
and *Ottomotto LLC*  
Telephone: 650.445.6400  
Facsimile: 650.329.8507  
BSF\_EXTERNAL\_UberWaymoLit@bsflp.com

Hamish Hume  
Jessica E Phillips  
Karen Leah Dunn  
Kyle N. Smith  
Martha Lea Goodman  
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP  
1401 New York Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20005

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.*  
and *Ottomotto LLC*  
Telephone: 202.237.2727  
Facsimile: 202.237.6131  
BSF\_EXTERNAL\_UberWaymoLit@bsflp.com

John P. Lahad  
Joseph S. Grinstein  
SUSMAN GODFREY LLP  
1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5100  
Houston, TX 77002

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.*  
and *Ottomotto LLC*  
Telephone: 713.653.7859  
Uber-sg@lists.susmangodfrey.com

William Christopher Carmody  
Shawn J. Rabin  
Cory Buland  
Halley W. Josephs  
Ian M. Gore  
SUSMAN GODFREY LLP  
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10019

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.*  
and *Ottomotto LLC*  
Telephone: 212.336.8330  
Uber-sg@lists.susmangodfrey.com



Genevieve Vose Wallace  
Matthew R. Berry  
SUSMAN GODFREY LLP  
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 3800  
Seattle, WA 98101

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.*  
and *Ottomotto LLC*  
Telephone: 206.516.3836  
Facsimile:  
Uber-sg@lists.susmangodfrey.com

John L. Cooper  
FARELLA BRAUN + MARTEL LLP  
235 Montgomery Street, 17th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104

Appointed by Court as: *Special Master*  
Telephone: 415.954.4410  
Facsimile: 415.954.4480  
jcooper@fbm.com

☐ (MAIL). I placed the envelope for collection and mailing, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this firm's practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Los Angeles, California.

☐ (OVERNIGHT DELIVERY). I deposited in a box or other facility regularly maintained by FedEx, an express service carrier, or delivered to a courier or driver authorized by said express service carrier to receive documents, a true copy of the foregoing document in sealed envelopes or packages designated by the express service carrier, addressed as stated above, with fees for overnight delivery paid or provided for.

☒ (E-MAIL or ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION). Based on a court order or *an agreement of the parties to accept service by e-mail or electronic transmission*, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the e-mail addresses listed. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on **September 13, 2017**, at San Francisco, California.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Hayes P. Hyde  
(Type or print name)

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/ Hayes P. Hyde  
(Signature)